

Nogales Interagency Consultation Summary

Wednesday, May 25, 2016 11:00 – 12:15

Teleconference

Participants: Michael Barton (HDR), Laura Berry (EPA), Beverly Chenausky (ADOT), Alan Hansen (FHWA), Mark Hoffman (ADOT), Jeff Houk (FHWA), Joonwon Joo (ADOT), Marinela Konomi (ADOT), Carlos Lopez (ADOT), Catherine Luke-McDowell (ADEQ), Louis Maslyk (HDR), Clifton Meek (EPA), Amy Moran (Wilson & Co.), Karina O'Connor (EPA), Meg Patulski (EPA), Ed Stillings (FHWA), Ryan Templeton (ADEQ), Jerry Walmsley (EPA), Tremaine Wilson (FHWA).

ITEM 1: Carlos Lopez provided an overview of SR 189. This study is conducting an environmental study and a Design Concept Report (DCR) that will include up to a 30% design, the main environmental document is an Environmental Assessment (EA) in partnership with the FHWA. The current funding includes \$2M for the environmental study and 30% level of design FY2016, for FY2018 programmed \$4M for final design of this project and FY2021 we anticipate \$24M for construction. That covers the fiscal constraints and the main deliverables for the project which would be the EA and DCR.

Question: Can you address the expansion of the Mariposa Port of Entry, it sounds like that has already been completed, and how that expansion has impacted traffic between 2014 when that was completed and now? How does the 2011 traffic data compare with post-construction traffic data?

Answer: We initiated a study in 2011 and that is when developed the tool that we used for the analysis. It is important that we keep the 2011 as our baseline as the tool for model was calibrated under those conditions. In early 2015 we (Wilson) collected traffic samples related to traffic volumes to aide in forecast for 2014. Found that the forecast was consistent with what was found in the field and felt that the methodology that was used to forecast future traffic was doing a good job, therefore we continued to use the methodology looking out to 2040. The interim study on 2014 report provided a snapshot of the interchange performance found that it was not performing as good as 2011. Generally speaking the traffic data in the 2014 traffic report should be consistent with how things are operating now.

Continuing on slide number 5, summary table of existing and future forecasts, the segments began at POE moving closer to I-19 interchange. There's a high school and commercial area near interchange traffic begins to increase. These estimates take into account the expansion and assume that the POE operates at full capacity.

Q: Assuming the difference in increase traffic is due to increase in local traffic and not international traffic, is that correct?

A: Yes, that's correct.

The next slide, our study process followed two stage approach stage one was to identify a corridor to link traffic and in prior studies we identified three corridor alternatives that are noted on slide 6. The first alternative was a corridor management corridor with access management and improvement at interchange. The second is an expressway alternative one for local traffic and adjacent a frontage road

to serve as expressway to the I-19. The third alternative is called a connector route, will create a new connection at the POE and include improvements at existing interchange.

The next slide shows the six criteria to evaluate alternatives and through further discussions and public input the corridor management was moved as preferred alternative, the other two were eliminated.

Then the next goal was to identify types of improvements with the recommended route.

Q: Can you elaborate on the local preference on the corridor management alternative? Why wouldn't the other two alternatives accommodate that? How is economic development incorporated? What was the time horizon for the land use development in the area?

A: Recognizing that SR189 is a trade corridor and economic corridor there was a strong support in keeping similar configuration and access as much as possible to enable economic development. The other alternatives would by-pass the current access and activities to their properties. We also received a resolution from City of Nogales and Santa Cruz County Supporting alternative one. Also concern about bypassing access to existing areas, losing drive by businesses, there are plans to develop commercial and industrial uses along the route. We assumed the development included in traffic model build out, one was expansion of the port and the other for local development was originally done with a growth rate but then refined by looking at land use and zoning for undeveloped parcels and ran a trip generation based on a fully developed land use opportunities for the parcels in the project area. The draft EA includes the review of all plans that were reviewed to capture all the planned development. The planning horizon listed in EA lists the horizon of 2035.

Slide number eight and nine shows the next goal to identify best interchange concept originally identified six type including a flyover connection, a diamond interchange. Slide number ten shows the evaluation of the preferred improvements and the flyover configuration on slide eight shows preferred configuration. We refined the concepts to develop a build alternative to be used in the DCR and EA as shown on slide 11 and 12 consistent with the information we received. The connection to the high school would include a grade separation at the intersection, the blue lines are bridge structure and that bridge will go over that interchange, the red are retaining walls. This design meets traffic operation at acceptable level and allows for better access to the freeway interchange.

Q: Are you going to be adding any general purpose lanes?

A: We are adding general purpose lane east of I-19 to Grande Avenue to help move traffic through the intersection and turn lanes, generally from Grande to about Lomas Mariposa, about a mile and a half.

Slide thirteen shows the design concept consistent with \$64M construction with the two flyover ramps. The southbound exit will be improved to at right and left turn lanes, and a new flyover on the northbound, this is the ultimate build out unfunded. The funding on next slide shows a shortfall of \$40-\$80, a TIGER grant application was submitted for \$64M and there has been an appropriation for this project, there is activity to find funding for the shortfall.

Q: As a clarification, when I look at the traffic report for the DCR anything that is labeled interim would be portions that are funded and those labeled ultimate would be unfunded, is that correct?

A: Yes.

Lastly our next steps, we submitted the EA to FHWA we plan on releasing in July with public hearing in early August. The DCR out to 30% design should be completed this summer with the final DCR and final EA completed in calendar year 2016.

Q: Can you make sure EPA receives a copy of EA.

A: Tremaine Wilson wanted to review EA first and would follow up with EPA to ensure they receive information.

ITEM 2: Beverly Chenausky started the discussions on additional clarifications requested by EPA for the Project of Air Quality Concern Questionnaire and review of the written responses to EPA comments. Originally we wanted to provide an updated version of the questionnaire but we thought it would be helpful if we discussed some of the questions and concerns before modifying the questionnaire. The first response regarding the CANAMEX corridor ADOT provided a response related to the designation of I-11 as a replacement of what was formally known as the CANAMEX corridor and provided an announcement of the NOI for the I-11 Tier I EIS that is under development. We are assuming most of the freight improvements will be managed through those projects as we do not have information on the improvements on the I-11.

Q: There seems to be a disconnect between the DeConcini and Mariposa port connections, wouldn't the commercial trucks be using the Mariposa and not the I-19? Will the CANAMEX corridor be over the I-19 or a new facility?

A: The 2040 build scenario includes the build out of the port, but we would not know the improvements on the I-19 until the Tier I study recommends improvements. The I-11 as identified in the FAST Act includes the I-19 from Nogales to Tucson, I-10 from Tucson to Phoenix, and US 93 from Phoenix to Nevada border. The CANAMEX terminology is no longer being used as the I-11 has been officially designated and we are in the early phases of identifying environmental impacts, the air quality impact will be addressed as part of the Tier II environmental analysis.

Amy Moran discussed most of the questions on the traffic questions. In terms to the question related to why there were no net changes in trucks between the build and the no-build alternatives, the forecast includes the maximum number of vehicles at POE and maximum build out of local traffic, the no build already incorporated worst case regardless of whether the movement actually allowable in the corridor, this maximum demand is necessary to show the benefits from the different alternatives. As clarification, there is no model available so a manual forecast on local truck and land port of entry was performed.

Q: I understand max capacity POE at least 30% increase from local it is not clear why local traffic would not increase?

A: Trips are driven by origin and designation and our assumptions is corridor will generate certain number of trips regardless if they could actually occur and regardless of how long it takes. The traffic is

all available traffic for both no-build and builds to evaluate complete demand in the corridor and required improvements.

Q: How is the DeConcini factored in, the buses and local traffic should be impacted?

A: There are additional local traffic documented in the 2040 report and Grande Avenue already captures this traffic.

Q: Is there is no travel demand model for this area?

A: There was no model available at the time we were developing forecast that captured the full travel demand. ADOT does have a statewide model, what was available at the time was a 2035 forecast, the statewide model is more macro and not focused to specific corridors, the STDN uses external zones that loads traffic with the DeConcini and Mariposa combined as a result the statewide model was under estimating traffic at that time of this analysis. As a result of this and other studies we did not think it was representative of the local conditions. We can provide travel demand documentation of the statewide travel demand model, for clarification.

Q: I don't understand the assumption that everything is the same regardless of what occurs in the corridor, and then you would never have an increase in travel with project? Additionally the traffic study information is presenting different results that what is in the questionnaire.

A: In this example the general purpose lane is acting as congestion relief and not an additional travel, because we are not changing access points or generating additional trips or travel. In the questionnaire we have a table that includes a no-build without the project that shows improvement of the LOS just not showing increase in traffic. The revised questionnaire will include more information on the traffic assumptions and results to clarify the differences between the build and no-build scenarios. We will be matching the tables between the traffic studies, the questionnaire and EA to ensure information is consistent.

In the interest of time it was discussed that the questionnaire would be revised and traffic assumptions will be summarized and distributed to the group along with a suggestion of a follow up meeting coming in the next couple of weeks. Other discussion occurred related to noting that this project will be minimally increasing the trucks over many years of the project and it is somewhat of a minor project in regards to increasing truck traffic. There were some discussion that when you read the purpose and need of the project it is describe as a major freight corridor, as such it is hard to understand how a freight improvement project would not increase traffic in the future, and that there is inconsistency between the importance of the project and the what the number show.

Item 3: Will be discussed at a later meeting, brief mention that a consultation document will be circulated describing planning assumptions for a regional analysis.

NEXT STEPS: ADOT project team will modify and change the Project of Air Quality Concern Questionnaire to clarify some of the concerns and circulate for review along with suggested range for next meeting. White paper to explain traffic data will be attached to questionnaire.